

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	
)	Docket No. 03-cr-90-P-S
VICKI RANNI,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

ORDER ON DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO REMOVE CIMS CLASSIFICATION

Before the Court is Defendant Ranni’s *pro se* Motion to Remove CIMS Classification (Docket # 81). As explained herein, the Court DENIES the motion WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

In October 2003, Ranni and co-defendant Thomas Shafer pleaded guilty to various counts of an Information (Docket # 31) charging them for their involvement in three bank robberies. This Court proceeded to impose judgment and sentence, which included a three-year term of supervised release for each Defendant. (See Judgments (Docket #s 46 & 47) at 3.) In addition to the standard conditions of supervised release, the Court imposed a special condition preventing Defendants from having “communication or contact” with each other. (See id. at 4.) In July 2008, Defendants moved to modify this condition so that they could “marry . . . upon their release from prison.” (See Def.’s Mot. for Modification (Docket # 68) at 2.) In September 2008, the Court denied Defendants’ request without prejudice. (See Order (Docket # 72).)

Defendant Ranni now moves to remove the separation (CIMS) classification resulting from the special condition of supervised release; in other words, this Motion appears simply to renew Defendants’ earlier request for modification. In short, the Court

continues to believe that the special condition “serves the twin purposes of protecting the public from future crime and encouraging Defendants’ rehabilitation, and is [] ‘reasonably related to’ permissible purposes of supervised release.” (*Id.* at 2.) *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3583(d)(1); USSG § 5D1.3(b). To the extent Defendant Ranni’s Motion requests an order compelling the Government “to contact appropriate regional office authorities for both parties and remove the [classification]” or to provide any other type of administrative remedy, the Court cannot grant the requested relief.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES WITHOUT PREJUDICE Defendant Ranni’s *pro se* Motion to Remove CIMS Classification (Docket # 81). As previously indicated, once Defendants commence their terms of supervised release, the Court is willing to consider a renewed motion for modification or removal of the special condition, depending on the status of each Defendant’s rehabilitation.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ George Z. Singal
United States District Judge

Dated this 22nd day of June, 2009.